

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated March 24, 2004, claims 1, 11, 14, 23, 26 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1-30 are in the case. The Applicants respectfully request reexamination and reconsideration of the present application.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8, 10, 11, 13-23, 25-28 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Ashby, III et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,852,803).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

The independent claims now include a direct connection between the service agent and a remotely located authorized representative of the computer related product and interactively sharing information stored on the service agent with the authorized representative during troubleshooting or servicing of the computer related product.

In contrast, Ashby, III et al. does not disclose this feature of the Applicants' claimed invention. For example, although Ashby, III et al. discloses "...recording and retrieving voice information into a label attachable to a product...", clearly Ashby, III et al. does **not** disclose interactively sharing information stored on the service agent with an authorized representative **during** troubleshooting or servicing of the product, like the Applicants' claimed invention. Accordingly, Ashby, III et al. cannot anticipate the claims. As such, the Applicants' respectfully submit that these rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 9 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashby, III et al. in view of Moore (U.S. Patent No. 5,983,182). The Office Action rejected claims 12, 24 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ashby, III et al. in view of Shaw (U.S. Patent No. 6,568,596).

The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections because at least **one** of the Applicants' claimed elements are missing from or not taught in the cited references and the Applicant's invention has advantages not appreciated by the cited references.

Specifically, the cited references, when combined, are missing the Applicants' claimed direct connection between the service agent and a remotely located authorized representative of the computer related product and interactively sharing information stored on the service agent with the authorized representative during troubleshooting or

Serial No.: 09/730,422
Attorney Docket No.: AUS9-2000-0593-US1

servicing of the computer related product. Hence, the combination of the Ashby, III et al. reference with either the Shaw or Moore references does **not** disclose all of the elements of the Applicants' claims, and thus, **cannot** render the Applicants' invention obvious. In Re Evanega. This **failure** of the cited references, either alone or in combination, to disclose, suggest or provide motivation for the Applicant's claimed invention indicates a lack of a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP 2143).

With regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03).

In view of the arguments and amendments set forth above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims of the subject application are in immediate condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding claim rejections and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to expedite and further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at (818) 885-1575 if the Examiner has any questions or concerns.

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: June 24, 2004



Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicants
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX